

show appreciation of their liberality towards a work which is as much yours as theirs?

Yes, my friends, the seminary is in want. It is in want of MONEY, which you are occupying as the Lord's stewards.

A. C. Hopkins.

Charlestown, W. Va.

OFFERING.

By Bertha G. Crozier.

Dear Lord, I come to Thee with empty hands,

No gift I bring.

So busy was I, that there seemed no time
For garnering.

To one athirst beside me Lord, I gave
The cup I bore.

And to a weary comrade lent the strength
He needed sore.

A little tender child, in tears afraid,
Clung close to me.

And him I carried. So to glean, my hands
Were never free.

Dear Lord, ashamed I hide my face! I came

Through golden lands

And yet, at last, can only offer Thee
My weary hands!

—Harper's Monthly.

INFANT SALVATION AND OUR CONFESSION.

Shall we Amend or Put any Foot Notes to the Confession of Faith?

I have been very much interested in a series of articles in the "Cumberland Presbyterian Banner" on the atonement. One reason has been the fact that we are soon to say if any changes shall be made to our old book. I have read these articles carefully, and this has made me feel and believe, more earnestly than ever, that we need no changes of any kind in our grand old Confession. You will find just as much objection to the language of the Bible as to that of the Confession of Faith.

I remember an incident that occurred when I was a young man preaching in Alabama. During a meeting in a neighboring congregation a gentleman quite prominent and influential made a profession of religion. A minister of a different church was anxious to have him unite with his church. In order to show him the hard doctrines of Calvin he gave him one of our Confessions of Faith, asking him to read it carefully. After he had read it, the brother who gave it to him asked him what he thought of it. The answer was, he did not have near as much trouble with the coarse print as with the fine. The result was he joined the Presbyterian Church, notwithstanding the fact that he had not been raised under the influences of that Church.

My candid conviction is, that the great trouble is, that, as a rule the distinctive doctrines of our Church, the very thing needed at this time, are not preached as they should be. We need more of Paul's preaching. I think the history of the Church will prove that the great revivals in the past have been when these grand old doctrines have been clearly and

boldly proclaimed. How about the Reformation under the old reformers, Luther, Calvin and Knox, with many others? How about that which swept over the country following the preaching of Edwards?

I wish to call attention to an editorial in the "Cumberland Presbyterian Banner" of October 9, last, in which the editor calls attention to the fact that Dr. Chadwick teaches that there is a difference between "blood shed" and "blood applied." His teaching is that "blood shed" is for the inherent perversity of nature, "blood applied" for personal transgression. He makes "shed blood" take away original sin. "Applied blood" personal transgression. If that be true, does it not necessarily follow that all infants are born in a state of grace? None of the race, infant or adult, can be saved except in consequence of Christ's work of atonement, which is all a work of rich, free, unbounded grace. If infants are saved (and this is what he is trying to prove), a doctrine I surely believe and our Church teaches, their salvation is by grace, and their sweet voices will be heard singing the glories and wonders of redemption by the blood of the Lamb. All the redeemed of every age, and tongue and tribe will unite in the one song of redeeming love.

I would like to ask if blood shed and not applied can be of any benefit in any case? How about the blood of the Paschal Lamb, when the Passover was instituted? If the blood was shed, but not applied to the door-posts and lintels as directed, would there have been any escape for those in the house?

I wish to call attention to another statement of Dr. Chadwick in the paper of October 30, "Is not saving faith, or the faith by which we are justified, the gift of God? By no means. The grace, justification, salvation, all the means, light and suasion, the enabling ability, all, all are the gifts of God. But the faith that lays hold on eternal life is the simple and exclusive act of man."

I would like to see how the good brother can reconcile the two phrases, "The enabling ability" and the "simple and exclusive act of man."

He says further: "But some one may ask, does not the following text affirm that faith is the gift of God, namely, 'By grace are ye saved through faith and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God?'"

We answer no! He says the gift is not faith, but salvation. I ask, if salvation does not include faith, what does it include? Can there be any salvation without faith? Paul said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."

I fear the good brother in his effort to get rid of the grand old doctrine as taught in the old Confession of Faith, has fallen from grace.

I am fully persuaded that in these days, when there appears to be a tendency to laxity of doctrine, the closer we stick to our grand old book, just as it is, the better will it be for the Church we love so dearly, that has always stood for sound doctrine, and contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

W. W. M.

Statesville, N. C.

SECRETARY ROOT AND THE CONGO.

Secretary Root retires from the cabinet to enter the senate, having, as we believe, accomplished more for the peace of the world than any man of his time. There are to his credit about ninety different treaties, all of them having as a leading feature the removal of causes of international friction and the substitution of arbitration for all other means of settling international disputes. At the same time he has always taken a manly and decided stand in cases where the rights of our citizens in foreign lands were in question or where treaty rights respecting our foreign missionary work were concerned. He has also shown himself the friend of the oppressed in all lands, as was so markedly the case with his distinguished and lamented predecessor.

According to our judgment and our feeling both, no act of his great career as secretary of state does him more honor or more entitles him to the gratitude of the African race and of those who are interested in their welfare than the one just made public, in which he lays down the following as conditions precedent to any recognition by our government of the transfer of the sovereignty from King Leopold to Belgium of the Congo Independent State. We quote from the Washington Post of January 29:

"Baron Moncheur, on November 4 last, sent Secretary Root a note informing him of the acquisition of the Congo Free State by Belgium, and stating that the Belgian government would 'promptly issue exequaturs to consular officers of the governments which request it.'"

Root's Five Demands.

"Secretary Root sent a reply on January 11, in which he voiced five principal demands, as follows:

A specific assurance from Belgium that she will respect the Brussels act of 1890, of which the United States is a full signatory, and especially article 2, as quoted, providing for humane treatment of the natives.

Abolition of the labor tax.

Restoration to the natives of land formerly held by them according to native communal customs.

Institution of the freedom of trade guaranteed by the treaty of 1891 between the United States and the Congo.

An agreement to submit to arbitration economical and commercial questions which shall prove especially difficult of settlement otherwise.

Victory for Reformers.

Secretary Daniels of the Congo Reform Association, said:

"Our association regards the State Department's note to Belgium as the most important victory yet won. The position taken by Mr. Root is essentially identical with that taken by Sir Edward Grey. Face to face with the demands of the United States and Great Britain, Belgium must either accede to them or force such action that an international conference may result."

It is one thing to know how to give, and another thing not to know how to keep.—Seneca.